REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated December 18, 2003. Claims 125, 128, 129, 130, 132, 133, and 137-140 are presented for examination, of which Claims 137-40 are in independent form. Claims 125, 128, 129 and 132 have been amended to define more clearly what Applicants regard as their invention. Claims 124, 126, 131 and 134-36 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and Claims 137-40 have been added to assure Applicant of a full measure of protection of the scope to which he deems himself entitled. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Applicant notes that an Information Disclosure Statement was filed on April 3, 2003, as evidenced aby a return postcard (copy attached) bearing the Patent and Trademark Office stamp with that date. It is noted that that paper is not listed in the PAIR system record for the subject application. Nonetheless, since that paper was timely, and properly, filed (before issuance of the first Office Action after the filing of an RCE in January 2003), Applicant believed himself entitled to have the information cited therein considered. For the convenience of the Office, a copy of that Information Disclosure Statement, including attachments, is submitted herewith, and it is respectfully requested that with the Examiner's next communication he provide an initialed copy of the form PTO-1449 submitted with that Information Disclosure Statement.

Claims 124-26 and 128-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from U.S. Patent 5,398,311 (Seto) in view of U.S. Patents 4,897,638 (Kokunishi et al.) and 5,562,350 (Sakurai).

The general nature of the invention, and the prior art, have been adequately discussed in Applicant's prior papers, and it is not deemed necessary to repeat that discussion in full.

Independent Claim 137 is directed to an outline apparatus that comprises a storage unit configured to store coordinate values of outline points of a character corresponding to a character code, and a plurality of vector data corresponding to each of the outline points, where each of the vector data indicates moving amounts in x and y directions of the corresponding outline point, and where at least one of outline points has different vector data in conjunction with weight value in the same character size. Also provided are a receiving unit configured to receive a character code and a weight value, and a reading unit configured to read out coordinate values of outline points corresponding to the received character code from the storage unit. An acquisition unit is provided, and is configured to acquire vector data corresponding to the coordinate values and the weight value read by the reading unit, and a calculation unit converts the coordinate values read by the reading unit based on the vector data acquired by the acquisition unit.

The correspondence between the storage unit of Claim 137 and the specification is as follows. At page 45, line 24, to page 47, line 17, and in Fig. 24 is described a storage unit configured to store coordinate values of outline points of a character corresponding to a character code (FIG. 24, X,Y), and a plurality of vector data corresponding to each of the outline points (VEC-X1, VEC-Y1, VEC-X2, VEC-Y2), with each of vector data indicating moving amounts in the x and the y direction of the corresponding outline point, and

where at least one of outline points has different vector data in conjunction with weight value in the same character size value (in FIG. 24, vector data for control point (a) changes in x direction at weight 4, vector data for control point (b) changes at weights 3, 5 and 7).

Among other important features of independent Claim 137, is having a plurality of vector data depending upon weight values in a given font size. By virtue of this feature, a natural character pattern can be obtained regardless of the weight value being used.

Seto relates to a technique of moving an outline point by changing the x-coordinate value in the x direction and the y-coordinate value in the y direction so as to make the line width uniform. As stated in the Office Action, however, Seto does not teach or suggest vector data for moving the outline points.

Kokunishi merely relates to generating a character pattern in different strokes. As recognized in the Office Action, Kokunishi fails to teach or suggest including a plurality of vectors selected in conjunction with weight value. Even if these two patents are combined as suggested in the Office Action, it is believed to be clear that the result would not meet the terms of Claim 137.

Sakurai, cited in the Office Action to remedy the deficiencies of Seto and Kokunishi as prior art against the claims, merely relates to changing vector data in accordance with font size. Accordingly, Applicant submits that nothing in Sakurai would teach or suggest changing vectors in accordance with weight values in the same font size. Even if combined in the proposed fashion with Seto and Kokunishi, therefore, Sakurai could not, in any way that

is apparent to Applicant, supply what is missing from the other two mentioned patents as prior art against Claim 137.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that even if combined in the manner proposed in the Office Action (and even assuming such combination would be proper), the result would still not meet the terms of Claim 137, nor would the result provide an apparatus capable of providing the advantage of an apparatus constructed according to that claim. Accordingly, Claim 137 is believed to be in condition for allowance.

The other independent claims each recite features similar to those discussed above with respect to Claim 137 and therefore are also believed to be patentable for the reasons discussed above.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant's opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as references against the independent claims herein. Those claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

This Amendment After Final Action is believed clearly to place this application in condition for allowance and its entry is therefore believed proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116.

At the very least, however, it is believed that the formal rejections have been overcome, and cancellation of Claims 124, 126, 131 and 134-36 eliminates all issues relating to those claims. Accordingly, In any event, however, entry of this Amendment After Final Action, as an earnest effort to advance prosecution and reduce the number of issues, is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe that issues remain outstanding, he she is respectfully requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney in an effort to resolve such issues and advance the case to issue.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

Attorney for Applicant

Leonard P. Diana

Registration No. 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO 30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY_MAIN 409061v1

	Commissioner for Patents Washington, D.C. 20231	Date 4 . 3 . 03 Atty. Docket 00867 .0006/1
FCHS-D-60	Sir: Kindly acknowledge receipt of the accompanying: Response to Official Action. Check for \$	deliverer.